arXiv:1405.7849v1 [cs.CC] 30 May 2014

Very narrow quantum OBDDs and width hierarchies for classical OBDDs

Farid Ablayev[1,⋆], Aida Gainutdinova[1,⋆], Kamil Khadiev[1,⋆⋆], and Abuzer Yakaryılmaz[2,3,⋆⋆⋆]

[1] Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Russia
[2] University of Latvia, Faculty of Computing, Raina bulv. 19 Riga, LV-1586, Latvia
[3] National Laboratory for Scientific Computing, Petrópolis, RJ, 25651-075, Brazil
fablayev@gmail.com,aida.ksu@gmail.com,kamilhadi@gmail.com,abuzer@lncc.br

Abstract. We present several results on comparative complexity for different variants of OBDD models.

- We present some results on comparative complexity of classical and quantum OBDDs. We consider a partial function depending on parameter k such that for any $k > 0$ this function is computed by an exact quantum OBDD of width 2 but any classical OBDD (deterministic or stable bounded error probabilistic) needs width 2^{k+1}.
- We consider quantum and classical nondeterminism. We show that quantum nondeterminism can be more efficient than classical one. In particular, an explicit function is presented which is computed by a quantum nondeterministic OBDD with constant width but any classical nondeterministic OBDD for this function needs non-constant width.
- We also present new hierarchies on widths of deterministic and nondeterministic OBDDs. We focus both on small and large widths.

1 Introduction

Branching programs are one of the well known models of computation. These models have been shown useful in a variety of domains, such as hardware verification, model checking, and other CAD applications (see for example the book by Wegener [20]). It is known that the class of Boolean functions computed by polynomial size branching programs are coincide with the class of functions computed by non-uniform log-space machines. Moreover branching program is a convenient model for considering different (natural) restrictive variants and different complexity measures such as size (number of inner nodes), length, and width.

⋆ Partially supported by RFBR Grant 14-01-06036.
⋆⋆ Partially supported by RFBR Grant 14-07-00557.
⋆⋆⋆ Work done in part while visiting the Kazan Federal University. Partially supported by CAPES, ERC Advanced Grant MQC, and FP7 FET project QALGO.

One of important restrictive branching programs is oblivious read once branching programs, also known in applied computer science as Ordered Binary Decision Diagrams (OBDD) [20]. Since the length of an OBDD is at most linear (in the length of the input), the main complexity measure is "width".

OBDDs also can be seen as nonuniform automata (see for example [2]). During the last decades different variants of OBDDs were considered, i.e. deterministic, nondeterministic, probabilistic, and quantum, and many results have been proved on comparative power of deterministic, nondeterministic, and randomized OBDDs [20]. For example, Ablayev and Karpinski [5] presented the first function that is polynomially easy for randomized and exponentially hard for deterministic and even nondeterministic OBDDs. More specifically, it was proven that OBDD variants of coRP and NP are different.

In the last decade quantum model of OBDD came into play [3],[14],[17]. It was proven that quantum OBDDs can be exponentially cheaper than classical ones and it was shown that this bound is tight [4].

In this paper we present the first results on comparative complexity for classical and quantum OBDDs computing partial functions. Then, we focus on the width complexity of deterministic and nondeterministic OBDDs, which have been investigated in different papers (see for more information and citations [11], [12]). Here we present very strict hierarchies for the classes of Boolean functions computed by deterministic and nondeterministic OBDDs.

The paper is organized as follows. The Section 2 contains the definitions and notations used in the paper. In Section 3, we compare classical and exact quantum OBDDs. We consider a partial function depending on parameter k such that, for any $k > 0$, this function is computed by an exact quantum OBDD of width 2 but deterministic or bounded error probabilistic OBDDs need width 2^{k+1}. Also it is easy to show that nondeterministic OBDD needs width $k + 1$. In Section 4, we consider quantum and classical nondeterminism. We show that quantum nondeterministic OBDDs can be more efficient than their classical counterparts. We present an explicit function which is computed by a quantum nondeterministic OBDD with constant width but any classical nondeterministic OBDD needs non-constant width. The Section 5 contains our results on hierarchies on the sublinear (5.1) and larger (5.2) widths of deterministic and nondeterministic OBDDs.

The proofs of lower bounds results (Theorem 2 and Lemma 3) are based on Pigeonhole principle. The lower bound on Theorem 4 uses the technique of Markov chains.

2 Preliminaries

We refer to [20] for more information on branching programs. The main model investigated throughout the paper is OBDD (Ordered Binary Decision Diagram), a restricted version of branching program.

In this paper we use following notations for vectors. We use subscript for enumerating elements of vector and strings and superscript for enumerating

vectors and strings. For a binary string ν, $\#_1(\nu)$ and $\#_0(\nu)$ are the number of 1's and 0's in ν, respectively. We denote $\#_0^k(\nu)$ and $\#_1^k(\nu)$ to be the numbers of 1's and 0's in the first k elements of string ν, respectively.

For a given $n > 0$, a probabilistic OBDD P_n with width d, defined on $\{0,1\}^n$, is a 4-tuple $P_n = (T, v^0, \mathit{Accept}, \pi)$, where

- $T = \{T_j : 1 \leq j \leq n \text{ and } T_j = (A_j(0), A_j(1))\}$ is an ordered pairs of (left) stochastic matrices representing the transitions, where, at the j-th step, $A_j(0)$ or $A_j(1)$, determined by the corresponding input bit, is applied.
- v^0 is a zero-one initial stochastic vector (initial state of P_n).
- $\mathit{Accept} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, d\}$ is the set of accepting nodes.
- π is a permutation of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ defining the order of testing the input bits.

For any given input $\nu \in \{0,1\}^n$, the computation of P_n on ν can be traced by a stochastic vector which is initially v^0. In each step j, $1 \leq j \leq n$, the input bit $x_{\pi(j)}$ is tested and then the corresponding stochastic operator is applied:

$$v^j = A_j(x_{\pi(j)})v^{j-1},$$

where v^j represent the probability distribution vector of nodes after the j-th steps, $1 \leq j \leq n$. The accepting probability of P_n on ν is

$$\sum_{i \in Accept} v_i^n.$$

We say that a function f is computed by P_n with bounded error if there exists an $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ such that P_n accepts all inputs from $f^{-1}(1)$ with a probability at least $\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon$ and P_n accepts all inputs from $f^{-1}(0)$ with a probability at most $\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon$. We say that P_n computes f *exactly* if $\varepsilon = 1/2$.

A deterministic OBDD is a probabilistic OBDD restricted to use only 0-1 transition matrices. In the other words, the system is always being in a single node and, from each node, there is exactly one outgoing transition for each tested input bit.

A nondeterministic OBDD (NOBDD) can have the ability of making more than one outgoing transition for each tested input bit from each node and so the program can follow more than one computational path and if one of the path ends with an accepting node, then the input is accepted (rejected, otherwise).

- An OBDD is called *stable* if each transition set T_j is identical for each level.
- An OBDD is called ID (ID-OBDD) if the input bits are tested in order $\pi = (1, 2, \ldots, n)$. If a *stable* ID-OBDD has a fixed width and transition rules for each n, then it can be considered as a realtime finite automaton.

Quantum computation is a generalization of classical computation [19]. Therefore, each quantum model can simulate its probabilistic counterparts. In some cases, on the other hand, the quantum models are defined in a restricted way, e.g., using only unitary operators during the computation followed by a single

measurement at the end, and so they may not simulate their probabilistic counterparts. Quantum automata literature has a lot of such results such as [13,6,8]. A similar result was also given for OBDDs in [17], in which a function with a small size of deterministic OBDD was given but the quantum OBDD defined in a restricted way needs exponential size to solve this function.

Quantum OBDDs that defined with the general quantum operators, i.e. superoperator [18,19,22], followed by a measurement on the computational basis at the end can simulate its classical counterpart with the same size and width. So we can always follow that any quantum class contains its classical counterpart.

In this paper, we follow our quantum results based stable ID-OBDDs, which are realtime quantum finite automata. But, we give the definition of quantum OBDDs for the completeness of the paper.

A quantum OBDD is the same as a probabilistic OBDD with the following modifications:

- The state set is represented by a d-dimensional Hilbert space over field of complex numbers. The initial one is $|\psi\rangle_0 = |q_0\rangle$ where q_0 corresponds to the initial node.
- Instead of a stochastic matrix, we apply a unitary matrix in each step. That is, $T = \{T_j : 1 \leq j \leq n \text{ and } T_j = (U_j^0, U_j^1)\}$, where, at the j-th step, U_j^0 or U_j^1, determined by the corresponding input bit, is applied,
- At the end, we make a measurement on the computational basis.

The state of the system is updated as follows after the j-th step:

$$|\psi\rangle_j = U_j^{x_{\pi(j)}}(|\psi\rangle_{j-1}),$$

where $|\psi\rangle_{j-1}$ and $|\psi\rangle_j$ represent the state of the system after the $(j-1)$-th and j-th steps, respectively, where $1 \leq j \leq n$.

The accepting probability of the quantum program on ν is calculated from $|\psi\rangle_n = (z_1, \ldots, z_d)$ as

$$\sum_{i \in Accept} |z_i|^2.$$

3 Exact Quantum OBDDs.

In [7], Ambainis and Yakaryılmaz defined a new family of unary promise problems: For any $k > 0$, $A^k = (A^k_{yes}, A^k_{no})$ such that $A^k_{yes} = \{a^{(2i)2^k} : i \geq 0\}$ and $A^k_{no} = \{a^{(2i+1)2^k} : i \geq 0\}$. They showed that each member of this family (A^k) can be solved exactly by a 2-state realtime quantum finite automaton (QFA) but any exact probabilistic finite automaton (PFA) needs at least 2^{k+1} states. Recently, Rashid and Yakaryılmaz [16] showed that bounded-error realtime PFAs also needs at least 2^{k+1} states for solving A^k.[4] Based on this promise problem,

[4] The same result is also followed for two-way nondeterministic finite automata by Geffert and Yakaryılmaz [10].

we define a partial function:

$$\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ , if } \#_1(\nu) = 0 \pmod{2^{k+1}} \\ 0 \text{ , if } \#_1(\nu) = 2^k \pmod{2^{k+1}} \\ * \text{ , otherwise} \end{cases},$$

where the function is not defined for the inputs mapping to "*". We call the inputs where the function takes the value of 1 (0) as yes-instances (no-instances).

Theorem 1. *For any $k \geq 0$, $\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}$ can be solved by a stable quantum ID-OBDD with width 2 exactly.*

The OBDD can be construct by the same way as QFA, which solves promise problem A^k [7].

We show that the width of deterministic, or bounded-error stable probabilistic OBDDs that solve $\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}$ cannot be less than 2^{k+1}.

Remark 1. Note that, a proof for deterministic OBDD is not similar to the proof for automata because potentially nonstability can give profit. Also this proof is different from proofs for total functions (for example, MOD_p) due to the existence of incomparable inputs. Note that, classical one-way communication complexity techniques also fail for partial functions (for example, it can be shown that communication complexity of $\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}$ is 1), and we need to use more careful analysis in the proof.

Deterministic stable ID-OBDD with width 2^{k+1} for $\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}$ can be easy constructed. We left open the case for bounded-error non-stable probabilistic OBDDs.

Theorem 2. *For any $k \geq 0$, there are infinitely many n such that any deterministic OBDD computing the partial function $\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}$ has width at least 2^{k+1}.*

Proof. Let $\nu \in \{0,1\}^n, \nu = \sigma\gamma$. We call γ valid for σ if $\nu \in (\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}})^{-1}(0) \cup (\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}})^{-1}(1)$. We call two substrings σ' and σ'' comparable if for all γ it holds that γ is valid for σ' iff γ is valid for σ''. We call two substrings σ' and σ'' nonequivalent if they are comparable and there exists a valid substring γ such that $\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}(\sigma'\gamma) \neq \texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}(\sigma''\gamma)$.

Let P be a deterministic OBDD computing the partial function $\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}$. Note that paths associated with nonequivalent strings must lead to different nodes. Otherwise, if σ and σ' are nonequivalent, there exists a valid string γ such that $\texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}(\sigma\gamma) \neq \texttt{PartialMOD}^{\texttt{k}}_{\texttt{n}}(\sigma'\gamma)$ and computations on these inputs lead to the same final node.

Let $N = 2^k$ and $\mathit{\Gamma} = \{\gamma : \gamma \in \{0,1\}^{2N-1}, \gamma = 0 \ldots 01 \ldots 1\}$. We will naturally identify any string ν with the element $a = \#_1(\nu) \pmod{2N}$ of additive group $\mathbb{Z}_{2N}$. We call two strings of the same length different if the numbers of ones by modulo $2N$ in them are different. We denote by $\rho(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) = \gamma^1 - \gamma^2$ the distance between numbers γ^1, γ^2. Note that $\rho(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \neq \rho(\gamma^2, \gamma^1)$.

Let the width of P is $t < 2N$. On each step i ($i = 1, 2, \dots$) of the proof we will count the number of different strings, which lead to the same node (denote this node v_i). On i-th step we consider $(2N-1)i$-th level of P.

Let $i = 1$. By pigeonhole principle there exist two different strings σ^1 and σ^2 from the set Γ such that corresponding paths lead to the same node v_1 of the $(2N-1)$-th level of P. Note that $\rho(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \neq N$, because in this case σ^1 and σ^2 are nonequivalent and cannot lead to the same node.

We will show by induction that on each step of the proof the number of different strings which lead to the same node increases.

Step 2. By pigeonhole principle there exist two different strings γ^1 and γ^2 from the set Γ such that corresponding paths from the node v_1 lead to the same node v_2 of the $(2N-1)2$-th level of P. In this case, the strings $\sigma^1\gamma^1, \sigma^2\gamma^1, \sigma^1\gamma^2$, and $\sigma^2\gamma^2$ lead to the node v_2. Note that $\rho(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \neq N$, because in this case $\sigma^1\gamma^1$ and $\sigma^1\gamma^2$ are nonequivalent and cannot lead to the same node.

Adding the same number does not change the distance between the numbers, so we have

$$\rho(\sigma^1 + \gamma^1, \sigma^2 + \gamma^1) = \rho(\sigma^1, \sigma^2)$$

and

$$\rho(\sigma^1 + \gamma^2, \sigma^2 + \gamma^2) = \rho(\sigma^1, \sigma^2).$$

Let $\gamma^2 > \gamma^1$. Denote $\Delta = \gamma^2 - \gamma^1$. Let us count the number of different numbers among $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1$, $\sigma^2 + \gamma^1$, $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1 + \Delta$, and $\sigma^2 + \gamma^1 + \Delta$. Because σ^1 and σ^2 are different and $\rho(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \neq N$, the numbers from the pair $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1$, and $\sigma^2 + \gamma^1$ coincide with corresponding numbers from the pair $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1 + \Delta$ and $\sigma^2 + \gamma^1 + \Delta$ iff $\Delta = 0 \pmod{2N}$. But $\Delta \neq 0 \pmod{2N}$ since the numbers γ^1 and γ^2 are different and $\gamma^1, \gamma^2 < 2N$. The numbers $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1 + \Delta$ and $\sigma^2 + \gamma^1 + \Delta$ cannot be a permutation of numbers $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1$ and $\sigma^2 + \gamma^1$ since $\rho(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \neq N$ and $\rho(\sigma^1, \sigma^2) \neq N$. In this case, at least 3 numbers from $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1$, $\sigma^2 + \gamma^1$, $\sigma^1 + \gamma^2$, and $\sigma^2 + \gamma^2$ are different.

Step of induction. Let the numbers $\sigma^1, \dots, \sigma^i$ be different on the step $i-1$ and the corresponding paths lead to the same node v_{i-1} of the $(2N-1)(i-1)$-th level of P.

By pigeonhole principle there exist two different strings γ^1 and γ^2 from the set Γ such that the corresponding paths from the node v_{i-1} lead to the same node v_i of the $(2N-1)i$-th level of P. So paths $\sigma^1\gamma^1, \dots, \sigma^i\gamma^1, \sigma^1\gamma^2, \dots, \sigma^i\gamma^2$ lead to the same node v_i. Let us estimate a number of different strings among them. Note that $\rho(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \neq N$ since, in this case, the strings $\sigma^1\gamma^1$ and $\sigma^1\gamma^2$ are nonequivalent but lead to the same node.

The numbers $\sigma^1, \dots, \sigma^i$ are different and $\rho(\sigma^l, \sigma^j) \neq N$ for each pair (l, j) such that $l \neq j$. Let $\sigma^1 < \dots < \sigma^i$. We will show that among $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1, \dots, \sigma^i + \gamma^1$ and $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1 + \Delta, \dots, \sigma^i + \gamma^1 + \Delta$ at least $i + 1$ numbers are different.

The sequence of numbers $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1, \dots, \sigma^i + \gamma^1$ coincide with the the sequence $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1 + \Delta, \dots, \sigma^i + \gamma^1 + \Delta$ iff $\Delta = 0 \pmod{2N}$. But $\Delta \neq 0 \pmod{2N}$ since γ^1 and γ^2 are different and $\gamma^1, \gamma^2 < 2N$.

Suppose that the sequence $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1 + \Delta, \dots, \sigma^i + \gamma^1 + \Delta$ is a permutation of the sequence $\sigma^1 + \gamma^1, \dots, \sigma^i + \gamma^1$. In this case, we have numbers $a_0, \dots, a_r$

from $\mathbb{Z}_{2N}$ such that all a_j are from the sequence $\sigma^1+\gamma^1,\ldots,\ \sigma^i+\gamma^1$, $a_0 = a_r = \sigma^1+\gamma^1$, and $a_j = a_{j-1}+\Delta$, where $j = 1,\ldots,r$. In this case, $r\Delta = 2Nm$. Because $N = 2^k$, $\Delta < 2N$, and $\Delta \neq N$ we have that r is even. For $z = r/2$ we have $z\Delta = Nm$. Since all numbers from $\sigma^1+\gamma^1,\ldots,\sigma^i+\gamma^1$ are different, we have that $\rho(a_0,a_z) = N$. So we have that a_0 and a_z are nonequivalent but the corresponding strings lead to the same node v_i. So after i-th step, we have that at least $i+1$ different strings lead to the same node v_i.

On the N-th step, we have that $N+1$ different strings lead to the same node v_N. Among these strings, there must be at least two nonequivalent strings. Thus we can follow that P cannot compute the function $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ correctly. □

Theorem 3. *For any $k \geq 0$, there are infinitly many n such that any nondeterministic OBDD computing the partial function $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ has width at least 2^{k+1}.*

The proof is similar to deterministic case with the following modifications. Let P – NOBDD, that computes $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$. We consider only accepting pathes in P. Note that if P computes $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ correctly then accepting paths associated with nonequivalent strings can not pass through the same nodes. Denote $N = 2^k$. Let $\Gamma = \{\gamma : \gamma \in \{0,1\}^{2N-1}, \gamma = \underbrace{0\ldots0}_{2N-1-j}\ \underbrace{1\ldots1}_{j}, j = 0,\ldots,2N-1\}$.

Denote V_l – a set of nodes on the l-th level of P. Assume that the width of P is less than $2N$, that is, $|V_l| < 2N$ for each $l = 0,\ldots,n$.

Denote $V_l(\gamma, V)$ – a set of nodes of l-th level through which accepting paths, leading from the nodes of set V and corresponding to string γ, pass.

On step i $(i = 1,2,\ldots)$ of the proof we consider $(2N-1)i$-th level of P. Because $|V_{2N-1}| < 2N$, on the first step of the proof we have that there exists two different strings σ^1,σ^2 from the set Γ such that $V_{2N-1}(\sigma^1,V_0) \cap V_{2N-1}(\sigma^2,V_0) \neq \emptyset$. Denote this nonempty intersection G_1. Next we continue our proof considering only accepting paths which pass through the nodes of G_1.

Using the same ideas as for deterministic case we can show that the number of strings with different numbers of ones by modulo $2N$, such that corresponding accepting paths lead to the same set of nodes, increases with each step of the proof.

On the N-th step of the proof we will have that there must be two different nonequivalent strings such that corresponding accepting paths lead to the same set G_N of nodes. That implies that P does not compute the function $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ correctly.

Theorem 4. *For any $k \geq 0$, there are infinitely many n such that any stable probabilistic OBDD computing $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ with bounded error has width at least 2^{k+1}.*

The proof of the Theorem is based on the technique of Markov chains and the details are given in Appendix A.

4 Nondeterministic Quantum and Classical OBDDs.

In [21], Yakaryılmaz and Say showed that nondeterministic QFAs can define a super set of regular languages, called exclusive stochastic languages [15]. This class contains the *complements* of some interesting languages: $PAL = \{w \in \{0,1\}^* : w = w^r\}$, where w^r is a reverse of w, $O = \{w \in \{0,1\}^* : \#_1(w) = \#_0(w)\}$, $SQUARE = \{w \in \{0,1\}^* : \#_1(w) = (\#_0(w))^2\}$, and $POWER = \{w \in \{0,1\}^* : \#_1(w) = 2^{\#_0(w)}\}$.

Based on these languages, we define three symmetric functions for any input $\nu \in \{0,1\}^n$:

$$\texttt{NotO}_\texttt{n}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ , if } \#_0(\nu) = \#_1(\nu) \\ 1 \text{ , otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$\texttt{NotSQUARE}_\texttt{n}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ , if } (\#_0(\nu))^2 = \#_1(\nu) \\ 1 \text{ , otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$\texttt{NotPOWER}_\texttt{n}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ , if } 2^{\#_0(\nu)} = \#_1(\nu) \\ 1 \text{ , otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Theorem 5. *Boolean Functions* $\texttt{NotO}_\texttt{n}$, $\texttt{NotSQUARE}_\texttt{n}$, *and* $\texttt{NotPOWER}_\texttt{n}$ *can be solved by a nondeterministic quantum OBDD with constant width.*

For all these three functions, we can define nondeterministic quantum (stable ID-) OBDD with constant width based on nondeterministic QFAs for languages O, $SQUARE$, and $POWER$, respectively [21].

The complements of $PAL, O, SQUARE$ and $POWER$ cannot be recognized by classical nondeterministic finite automata. But, for example, the function version of the complement of PAL, $\texttt{NotPAL}_\texttt{n}$, which returns 1 only for the non-palindrome inputs, is quite easy since it can be solved by a deterministic OBDD with width 3. Note that the order of such an OBDD is not natural $(1, \ldots, n)$. However, as will be shown soon, this is not the case for the function versions of the complements of the other three languages.

Theorem 6. *There are infinitely many* n *such that any NOBDD* P_n *computing* $\texttt{NotO}_\texttt{n}$ *has width at least* $\lfloor \log n \rfloor - 1$.

The proof of Theorem is based on the complexity properties of Boolean function $\texttt{NotO}_\texttt{n}$. At first we will discuss complexity properties of this function in Lemma 1. After that we will prove claim of Theorem.

Lemma 1. *There are infinitely many* n *such that any OBDD computing* $\texttt{NotO}_\texttt{n}$ *has width at least* $n/2 + 1$. *(For the proof see B).*

Proof of Theorem 6 Let function $\texttt{NotO}_\texttt{n}$ is computed by *NOBDD* P_n of width d, then by the same way as in the proof of Theorem 3 we have $d \geq \log(n/2+1) > \log n - 1$. □

By the same way we can show that there are infinitely many n such that any NOBDD P_n computing function $\texttt{NotSQUARE}_\texttt{n}$ has width at least $\Omega(\log(n))$ and any NOBDD P'_n computing function $\texttt{NotPOWER}_\texttt{n}$ has width at least $\Omega(\log\log(n))$.

5 Hierarchies for Deterministic and Nondeterministic OBDDs

We denote $\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}$ and $\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}$ to be the sets of Boolean functions that can be computed by *OBDD* and *NOBDD* of width $d = d(n)$, respectively, where n is the number of variables. In this section, we present some width hierarchies for $\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}$ and $\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}$. Moreover, we discuss relations between these classes. We consider $\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}$ and $\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}$ with small (sublinear) widths and large widths.

5.1 Hierarchies and relations for small width OBDDs

We have the following width hierarchy for deterministic and nondeterministic models.

Theorem 7. *For any integer n, $d = d(n)$, and $1 < d \leq n/2$, we have*

$$\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathsf{d}-1} \subsetneq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathsf{d}} \text{ and} \tag{1}$$

$$\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathsf{d}-1} \subsetneq \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}. \tag{2}$$

Proof of Theorem 7. It is obvious that $\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathsf{d}-1} \subseteq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}$ and $\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathsf{d}-1} \subseteq \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathsf{d}}$. Let us show the inequalities of these classes. For this purpose we use the complexity properties of known Boolean function $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$.

Let k be a number such that $1 < k \leq n/2$. For any given input $\nu \in \{0,1\}^n$,

$$\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } \#_1(\nu) = 0 \ (mod\ k), \\ 0, \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Lemma 2. *There is an OBDD (and so a NOBDD) P_n of width d which computes Boolean function $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ and $d = k$.*

Proof In each level, P_n counts number of 1's by modulo k. P_n answers 1 iff the number in the last step is zero. It is clear that the width of P_n is k. □

Lemma 3. *Any OBDD and NOBDD computing $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ has width at least k.*

Proof The proof is based on Pigeonhole principle. Let P be a deterministic OBDD computing the function $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$. For each input ν from $(\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}})^{-1}(1)$ there must be exactly one path in P leading from source node to accepting node. Let us consider k inputs $\{\nu^1, \nu^2, \ldots, \nu^k\}$ from this set such that the last k bits in $\nu^j (j = 1, \ldots, k)$ contains exactly j 1's and $(k-j)$ 0's. Let us consider the $(n-k)$-th level of P. The acceptance paths for different inputs from $\{\nu^1, \nu^2, \ldots, \nu^k\}$ must pass trough different nodes of the $(n-k)$-th level of P. So the width of the $(n-k)$-th level of P is at least k.

The proof for nondeterministic case is similar to deterministic one. For each input from $(\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}})^{-1}(1)$ for the function $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ there must be at least one path in P leading from the source node to an accepting node labelling this input.

The accepting paths for different inputs from the set $\{\nu^1, \nu^2, \ldots, \nu^k\}$ must go through different nodes of $(n-k)$-th level of P. □

Boolean function $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{d}}_{\mathtt{n}} \in \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ and $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{d}}_{\mathtt{n}} \in \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ due to Lemma 2 and Boolean function $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{d}}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}-1}$ and $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{d}}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}-1}$ due to Lemma 3. This completes the proof of the Theorem 7. □

We have the following relationships between deterministic and nondeterministic models.

Theorem 8. *For any integer n, $d = d(n)$, and $d' = d'(n)$ such that $d \leq n/2$ and $O(\log^2 d \log\log d) < d' \leq d-1$, we have*

$$\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \log(\mathtt{d}) \rfloor} \subsetneq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}} \text{ and} \tag{3}$$

$$\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}} \text{ and } \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}'} \text{ are not comparable.} \tag{4}$$

Proof of Theorem 8 We start with (3). By the same way as in the proof of Theorem 3, we can show that $\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \log(\mathtt{d}) \rfloor} \subseteq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ and, from Lemma 3, we know that $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{d}}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \log(\mathtt{d}) \rfloor}$. Then we have $\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}} \neq \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \log(\mathtt{d}) \rfloor}$.

We continue with (4). Let k be even and $1 < k \leq n$. For any given input $\nu \in \{0,1\}^n$,

$$\mathtt{NotO}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 0, \text{ if } \#^k_0(\nu) = \#^k_1(\nu) = k/2 \\ 1, \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Note that function $\mathtt{NotO}^{\mathtt{n}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ is identical to $\mathtt{NotO}_{\mathtt{n}}$.

Lemma 4. *Any OBDD computing $\mathtt{NotO}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ has width at least $k/2+1$.*

Proof The proof can be followed by the same technique given in the proof of Lemma 1. □

Lemma 5. *There is NOBDD P_n of width d that computes Boolean function $\mathtt{NotO}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ and $d \leq O(\log^2 k \log\log k)$. (For the proof see C).*

Remember that $O(\log^2 d \log\log d) \leq d' \leq d-1$, and, by Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, we have $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{d}}_{\mathtt{n}} \in \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ and $\mathtt{MOD}^{\mathtt{d}}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}'}$; by Lemma 5, we have $\mathtt{NotO}^{2\mathtt{d}-1}_{\mathtt{n}} \in \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}'}$; and, by Lemma 4, we have $\mathtt{NotO}^{2\mathtt{d}-1}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$. Therefore, we cannot compare these classes and so we can follow Theorem 8. □

5.2 Hierarchies and relations for large width OBDDs

In this section, we consider OBDDs of large width. We obtain some hierarchies which are different from the ones in the previous section (Theorem 7).

Theorem 9. *For any integer n, $d = d(n)$, $16 \leq d \leq 2^{n/4}$, we have*

$$\mathsf{OBDD}^{\lfloor \mathtt{d}/8 \rfloor - 1} \subsetneq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}} \text{ and} \tag{5}$$

$$\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \mathtt{d}/8 \rfloor - 1} \subsetneq \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}, \tag{6}$$

Proof of Theorem 9. It is obvious that $\mathsf{OBDD}^{\lfloor \mathtt{d}/8 \rfloor - 1} \subseteq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ and $\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \mathtt{d}/8 \rfloor - 1} \subseteq \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$.

We define Boolean function $\mathtt{EQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ as a modification of Boolean function *Shuffled Equality* which was defined in [5] and [1]. The proofs of inequalities are based on the complexity properties of $\mathtt{EQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$.

Let k be multiple of 4 such that $4 \leq k \leq 2^{n/4}$. The Boolean Function $\mathtt{EQS}_{\mathtt{n}}$ depends only on the first k bits.

For any given input $\nu \in \{0,1\}^n$, we can define two binary strings $\alpha(\nu)$ and $\beta(\nu)$ in the following way. We call odd bits of the input *marker bits* and even bits *value bits*. For any i satisfying $1 \leq i \leq k/2$, the value bit ν_{2i} belongs to $\alpha(\nu)$ if the corresponding marker bit $\nu_{2i-1} = 0$ and ν_{2i} belongs to $\beta(\nu)$ otherwise.

$$\mathtt{EQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}(\nu) = \begin{cases} 1, \text{ if } \alpha(\nu) = \beta(\nu) \\ 0, \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Lemma 6. *There is OBDD P_n of width $8 \cdot 2^{k/4} - 5$ which computes Boolean function $\mathtt{EQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$. (For the proof see E).*

Lemma 7. *There are infinitely many n such that any OBDD and NOBDD P_n computing $\mathtt{EQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ has width at least $2^{k/4}$. (For the proof see F). (For the proof see F)*

Boolean function $\mathtt{EQS}^{4\lceil \log(\mathtt{d}+5) \rceil - 12}_{\mathtt{n}} \in \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ and $\mathtt{EQS}^{4\lceil \log(\mathtt{d}+5) \rceil - 12}_{\mathtt{n}} \in \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ due to Lemma 6.

Boolean function $\mathtt{EQS}^{4\lceil \log(\mathtt{d}+5) \rceil - 12}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{OBDD}^{\lfloor \mathtt{d}/8 \rfloor - 1}$ and $\mathtt{EQS}^{4\lceil \log(\mathtt{d}+5) \rceil - 12}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \mathtt{d}/8 \rfloor - 1}$ due to Lemma 7. So $\mathsf{OBDD}^{\lfloor \mathtt{d}/8 \rfloor - 1} \neq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ and $\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \mathtt{d}/8 \rfloor - 1} \neq \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$. These inequalities prove Statements (5) and (6) and complete the proof of the Theorem 9. □

In the following theorem, we present a relationship between deterministic and nondeterministic models.

Theorem 10. *For any integer n, $d = d(n)$, and $d' = d'(n)$ satisfying $d \leq 2^{n/4}$ and $O(\log^4(d+1)\log\log(d+1)) < d' < d/8 - 1$, we have*

$$\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \log(\mathtt{d}) \rfloor} \subsetneq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}} \text{ and} \tag{7}$$

$$\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}} \text{ and } \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}'} \text{ are not comparable.} \tag{8}$$

Proof of Theorem 10. We start with (7). By the same way as in proof of Theorem 3, we can show that $\mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \log(\mathtt{d}) \rfloor} \subseteq \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$. By Lemma 7, we have $\mathtt{EQS}^{4\lceil \log(\mathtt{d}+5) \rceil - 12}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \log(\mathtt{d}) \rfloor}$ which means $\mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}} \neq \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\lfloor \log(\mathtt{d}) \rfloor}$.

Now we continue with (8). We use the complexity properties of Boolean function $\mathtt{NotEQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$, which is the inversion of $\mathtt{EQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$.

Lemma 8. *There are infinitely many n such that any OBDD P_n computing $\mathtt{NotEQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ has width at least $2^{k/4}$.*

Proof We can prove it by the same way as in the proof of Lemma 7. □

Lemma 9. *There is a NOBDD P_n of width d computing Boolean function* $\mathtt{NotEQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ *where* $d \leq O(k^4 \log k)$. *(For the proof see D).*

Remember that $O(\log^4(d+1)\log\log(d+1)) \leq d' \leq \lfloor d/8 \rfloor - 1$, and, by Lemma 7 and Lemma 6, we have $\mathtt{EQS}^{4\lceil\log(\mathtt{d}+5)\rceil-12}_{\mathtt{n}} \in \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$ and $\mathtt{EQS}^{4\lceil\log(\mathtt{d}+5)\rceil-12}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}'}$; by Lemma 9, we have $\mathtt{NotEQS}^{4\lceil\log(\mathtt{d})\rceil+4}_{\mathtt{n}} \in \mathsf{NOBDD}^{\mathtt{d}'}$; and, by Lemma 8, we have $\mathtt{NotEQS}^{4\lceil\log(\mathtt{d})\rceil+4}_{\mathtt{n}} \notin \mathsf{OBDD}^{\mathtt{d}}$. Therefore we cannot compare this classes and so we can follow Theorem 10. □

References

1. F. Ablayev. Randomization and nondeterminsm are incomparable for ordered read-once branching programs. Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity (ECCC), 4(21), 1997.
2. F. Ablayev and A. Gainutdinova. Complexity of quantum uniform and nonuniform automata. In Developments in Language Theory, volume 3572 of LNCS, pages 78–87. Springer, 2005.
3. F. Ablayev, A. Gainutdinova, and M. Karpinski. On computational power of quantum branching programs. In FCT, volume 2138 of LNCS, pages 59–70. Springer, 2001.
4. F. M. Ablayev, A. Gainutdinova, M. Karpinski, C. Moore, and C. Pollett. On the computational power of probabilistic and quantum branching program. Information Computation, 203(2):145–162, 2005.
5. F. M. Ablayev and M. Karpinski. On the power of randomized branching programs. In ICALP, volume 1099 of LNCS, pages 348–356. Springer, 1996.
6. A. Ambainis and R. Freivalds. 1-way quantum finite automata: strengths, weaknesses and generalizations. In FOCS, pages 332–341. IEEE Computer Society, 1998. (http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9802062).
7. A. Ambainis and A. Yakaryılmaz. Superiority of exact quantum automata for promise problems. Information Processing Letters, 112(7):289–291, 2012.
8. A. Bertoni and M. Carpentieri. Analogies and differences between quantum and stochastic automata. Theoretical Computer Science, 262(1-2):69–81, 2001.
9. R. Freivalds. Fast probabilistic algorithms. In Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 1979, volume 74 of LNCS, pages 57–69, 1979.
10. V. Geffert and A. Yakaryılmaz. Classical automata on promise problems. In DCFS 2014, LNCS. Springer, 2014. (To appear).
11. J. Hromkovic and M. Sauerhoff. Tradeoffs between nondeterminism and complexity for communication protocols and branching programs. In STACS, volume 1770 of LNCS, pages 145–156. Springer, 2000.
12. J. Hromkovic and M. Sauerhoff. The power of nondeterminism and randomness for oblivious branching programs. Theory of Computing Systems, 36(2):159–182, 2003.
13. A. Kondacs and J. Watrous. On the power of quantum Finite state automata. In FOCS, pages 66–75. IEEE Computer Society, 1997.
14. M. Nakanishi, K. Hamaguchi, and T. Kashiwabara. Ordered quantum branching programs are more powerful than ordered probabilistic branching programs under a bounded-width restriction. In COCOON, volume 1858 of LNCS, pages 467–476. Springer, 2000.

15. A. Paz. Introduction to Probabilistic Automata. Academic Press, New York, 1971.
16. J. Rashid and A. Yakaryılmaz. Implications of quantum automata for contextuality. In CIAA, LNCS. Springer, 2014 (To appear). arXiv:1404.2761.
17. M.Sauerhoff and D. Sieling. Quantum branching programs and space-bounded nonuniform quantum complexity. Theoretical Computer Science, 334(1-3):177–225, 2005.
18. J. Watrous. On the complexity of simulating space-bounded quantum computations. Computational Complexity, 12(1-2):48–84, 2003.
19. J. Watrous. Encyclopedia of Complexity and System Science, chapter Quantum computational complexity. Springer, 2009. arXiv:0804.3401.
20. I. Wegener. Branching Programs and Binary Decision Diagrams. SIAM, 2000.
21. A. Yakaryılmaz and A. C. C. Say. Languages recognized by nondeterministic quantum finite automata. Quantum Information and Computation, 10(9&10):747– 770, 2010.
22. A. Yakaryılmaz and A. C. C. Say. Unbounded-error quantum computation with small space bounds. Information and Computation, 279(6):873–892, 2011.

A The Proof of Theorem 4

Assume that there is a stable probabilistic OBDD P_n of width $d < 2^{k+1}$ computing $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ with probability $1/2 + \varepsilon$ for a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$. Let $v^j = (v^j_1, \ldots, v^j_d)$ be a probability distribution of nodes of P_n at the j-th level, where v^j_i is the probability of being in the i-th node at the j-th level. We can describe the computation of P_n on the input $\nu = \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n$ as follows:

- The computation of P_n starts from the initial probability distributions vector v^0.
- On the j-th step, $1 \leq j \leq n$, P_n reads input ν_{i_j} and transforms the vector v^{j-1} to $v^j = Av^{j-1}$, where A is the $q \times q$ stochastic matrix, $A = A(0)$ if $\nu_{i_j} = 0$ and $A = A(1)$ if $\nu_{i_j} = 1$.
- After the last (n-th) step of the computation P_n accepts the input ν with probability $P_{acc}(\nu) = \sum_{j \in Accept} v^n_j$. If $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}(\nu) = 1$ then we have $P_{acc}(\nu) \geq 1/2 + \varepsilon$ and if $\mathtt{PartialMOD}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}(\nu) = 0$ then we have $P_{acc}(\nu) \leq 1/2 - \varepsilon$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that P_n reads the inputs in the natural order $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. We consider only inputs $\tilde{\nu}_n, \ldots, \tilde{\nu}_1$ such that $\tilde{\nu}_i = \tilde{\nu}^0_i \tilde{\nu}^1_i$, where $\tilde{\nu}^0_i = \underbrace{0 \ldots 0}_{n-i}$, $\tilde{\nu}^1_i = \underbrace{1 \ldots 1}_{i}$.

For $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we denote by α^i the probability distribution after reading the part $\tilde{\nu}^0_i$, i.e. $\alpha^i = A^{n-i}(0)v^0$. There are only ones in the $\tilde{\nu}^1_i$, hence the computation after reading $\tilde{\nu}^0_i$ can be described by a Markov chain. That is, α^i is the initial probability distribution for a Markov process and $A(1)$ is the transition probability matrix.

According to the classification of Markov chains described in the Section 2 of the book by Kemeny and Snell[5], the states of the Markov chain are divided into ergodic and transient states. An *ergodic set of states* is a set which a process cannot leave once it has entered. A *transient set of states* is a set which a process can leave, but cannot return once it has left. An *ergodic state* is an element of an ergodic set. A *transient state* is an element of a transient set.

An arbitrary Markov chain C has at least one ergodic set. C can be a Markov chain without any transient set. If a Markov chain C has more than one ergodic set, then there is absolutely no interaction between these sets. Hence we have two or more unrelated Markov chains lumped together. These chains can be studied separately. If a Markov chain consists of a single ergodic set, then the chain is called an *ergodic chain*. According to the classification mentioned above, every ergodic chain is either regular or cyclic.

If an ergodic chain is regular, then for sufficiently high powers of the state transition matrix, A has only positive elements. Thus, no matter where the process starts, after a sufficiently large number of steps it can be in any state. Moreover, there is a limiting vector of probabilities of being in the states of the chain, that does not depend on the initial state.

[5] J. G. Kemeny and J. L. Snell. *Finite Markov Chains*. Van Nostrand Company, INC, 1960.

If a Markov chain is cyclic, then the chain has a period t and all its states are subdivided into t cyclic subsets ($t > 1$). For a given starting state a process moves through the cyclic subsets in a definite order, returning to the subset with the starting state after every t steps. It is known that after sufficient time has elapsed, the process can be in any state of the cyclic subset appropriate for the moment. Hence, for each of t cyclic subsets the t-th power of the state transition matrix A^t describes a regular Markov chain. Moreover, if an ergodic chain is a cyclic chain with the period t, it has at least t states.

Let $C_1, \ldots, C_l$ be cyclic subsets of states of Markov chain with periods $t_1, \ldots, t_l$, respectively, and D be the least common multiple of $t_1, \ldots, t_l$.

Lemma 10. *D must be a multiple of 2^{k+1}.*

Proof. Assume that D is not a multiple of 2^{k+1}. After every D steps, the process can be in any set of states containing the accepting state and the D-th power of M describes a regular Markov chain. From the theory of Markov chains, we have that there exists an α_{acc} such that $\lim_{r\to\infty} \alpha_{acc}^{r\cdot D} = \alpha_{acc}$, where α_{acc}^{i} represents the probability of process being in accepting state(s) after ith step. Hence, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, it holds that

$$|\alpha_{acc}^{r\cdot D} - \alpha_{acc}^{r'\cdot D}| < 2\varepsilon$$

for some big enough r, r'. Since D is not a multiple of 2^{k+1}, it can be represented as $D = m \cdot 2^l$ ($l \leq k$, m is odd). For any odd s, the number $s \cdot D$ is not a multiple of 2^{k+1}. P_n is supposed to solve $\mathtt{PartialMOD}_{\mathtt{n}}^{\mathtt{k}}$ with probability $1/2 + \varepsilon$ so we have $\alpha_{acc}^{s\cdot m\cdot 2^l 2^{k-l+1}} \geq 1/2 + \varepsilon$ and $\alpha_{acc}^{s\cdot m\cdot 2^l 2^{k-l}} \leq 1/2 - \varepsilon$. This contradicts with the inequality above for big enough s. □

Lemma 11. *There is a circle of period t, where t is a multiple of 2^{k+1}.*

Proof. The proof is followed from the facts that D is a multiple of 2^{k+1} that implies existence of $t \in \{t_1, \ldots, t_l\}$ such that t is a power of 2. Among such t there must be a multiple of 2^{k+1}. Otherwise D (the least common multiple of $t_1, \ldots, t_l$) can not be a multiply of 2^{k+1}. □

Since there is a circle of period t where t is a multiple of 2^{k+1}, we have $q \geq 2^{k+1}$.

B The Proof of Lemma 1

Let n be an even integer and P_n be an OBDD that computes $\mathtt{NotO}_{\mathtt{n}}$. Assume that P_n uses the natural order. The proof is similar for any other order. Now we compute the width of level $n/2$.

Let $\Sigma = \{\sigma^i \in \{0,1\}^{n/2} : \sigma^i = \underbrace{1\ldots1}_{i}\underbrace{0\ldots0}_{n/2-i}, 0 \leq i \leq n/2\}$ and σ^i and σ^j be any pair such that $i \neq j$. Assume that P_n reaches node v by input σ^i and node v' by input σ^j.

We show that $v \neq v'$. We define $\gamma \in \{0,1\}^{n/2}$ such that $\#_0(\gamma) = i$, which also means $\#_1(\gamma) = n/2 - i$.

Let us consider the computation on input (σ^i, γ). Note that P_n reaches 0 from node v using input γ since

$$\#_1(\sigma^i) + \#_1(\gamma) = n/2 = \#_0(\sigma^i) + \#_0(\gamma).$$

Let us consider the computation on input (σ^j, γ). OBDD P_n reaches 1 form node v' using input γ since

$$\#_1(\sigma^j) + \#_1(\gamma) = j + (n/2 - i) = n/2 + (j - i) \neq n/2.$$

It means $v \neq v'$. Note that $|\Sigma| = n/2 + 1$. Hence the width of level $n/2$ is at least $n/2 + 1$, which means that the width of P_n is at least $n/2 + 1$.

C The Proof of Lemma 5

We construct the NOBDD P_n. We use the fingerprinting method given in [9]. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_r$ be the first r prime numbers satisfying that

$$p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r > k,$$

where r is the minimal value. Note that $r \leq \log k$ since $p_r \geq 2$.

The NOBDD P_n consists of r parallel parts, each of them corresponds to one of p from $\{p_1, \ldots, p_r\}$. In the first step, P_n nondeterministically picks a p. Then, this branch counts the number of 1's by modulo p. If it is not equal to $(k/2 \mod p)$ at the end, P_n gives the answer of 1 and 0 otherwise. We need p nodes for each value from 0 to $p - 1$.

By the Chinese Remainder Theorem[6], if $\#_1^k(\nu) \neq k/2$ then there are at least one p_i such that $\#_1^k(\nu) \neq k/2 \mod p_i$. This means at least one branch gives the answer of 1. But if $\#_1^k(\nu) = k/2$, then for all p_i we have $\#_1^k(\nu) = k/2 \mod p_i$. This means each branch gives the answer of 0. Hence, P_n computes $\mathtt{NotO}_{\mathtt{n}}^{\mathtt{k}}$.

By Prime Number Theorem[7], we know that $p_r = O(r \ln r)$. And so $p_i \leq O(r \ln r)$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ since $p_i \leq p_r$. This means the width of i-th part is $p_i \leq O(r \ln r)$. Since $r \leq \log k$, the width of P_n is $d \leq r \cdot O(r \ln r) = O(\log^2 k \ln \log k)$.

D The Proof of Lemma 9

We construct the NOBDD P_n with the natural order. We use the fingerprinting method given in [9]. We will use the same notation given in the proof of Lemma 6. Let $p_1, \ldots, p_z$ be the first z prime numbers satisfying that

$$p_1 p_2 \cdots p_z > 2^{k/4},$$

[6] K. Ireland and M. Rosen. A Classical Introduction to Modern Number Theory, 2nd ed. *Springer-Verlag*, pages 34–38, 1990.

[7] H. G. Diamond. Elementary methods in the study of the distribution of prime numbers. *Bulletin of The American Mathematical Society*, 7:553–589, 1982.

where z is the minimal value. Note that $r \leq k/4$ since $p_z \geq 2$.

The NOBDD P_n consist of z parallel parts, each of them corresponds to one of p from $\{p_1, \ldots, p_z\}$. Let us consider input $\nu \in \{0,1\}^n$ and let $\nu^i = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

In the first step, P_n nondetermenistically picks a p. Then, this branch computes $r(\nu) = bin(\alpha(\nu)) - bin(\beta(\nu)) \mod p$). Here $bin(\alpha(\nu))$ is the binary represantation of $\alpha(\nu)$.

For computing $r(\nu)$ in i-th step, we should know three numbers: the value of $r(\nu^i) = bin(\alpha(\nu^i)) - bin(\beta(\nu^i)) \mod p$, the length of $\alpha(\nu^i)$, and the length of $\beta(\nu^i)$. Note that $r(\nu^i) \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$ and $|\alpha(\nu^i)|, |\beta(\nu^i)| \leq k/2$. If, in last step, $r(\nu^i)$ is not zero or $|\alpha(\nu)| \neq |\beta(\nu)|$, then this part answers 1 and 0 otherwise. We need $p \cdot k^2/4$ nodes for each value of triple $\Big(r(\nu^i), |\alpha(\nu^i)|, |\beta(\nu^i)|\Big)$ and two times more nodes in order to check the value of odd bits for knowing whether the following bit belongs to $\alpha(\nu)$ or to $\beta(\nu)$. This means that the width of this branch is $p \cdot k^2/2$.

By the Chinese Remainder Theorem[8], if $bin(\alpha(\nu)) \neq bin(\beta(\nu))$, then there is at least one p_i such that $bin(\alpha(\nu)) \neq bin(\beta(\nu)) \mod p_i$. That is, at least one branch gives the answer of 1. If the lengths are different, then each branch gives the answer of 1. But if $\alpha(\nu) = \beta(\nu)$, then, for all p_i, we have $bin(\alpha(\nu)) = bin(\beta(\nu)) \mod p_i$ and $|\alpha(\nu)| = |\beta(\nu)|$. That is, each branch gives the answer of 0. Hence P_n computes $\mathtt{NotEQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$.

By Prime Number Theorem[9], we know that $p_z = O(z \ln z)$ and so $p_i \leq O(z \ln z)$ for $1 \leq i \leq z$ since $p_i \leq p_z$. This means that the width of i-th part is $p_i \cdot k^2/2 \leq O(z \cdot k^2 \ln z)$. Since $z \leq k/4$, the width of P_n is $d \leq z \cdot O(z \cdot k^2 \ln z) = O(k^4 \log k)$.

E The Proof of Lemma 6

We construct such OBDD P_n which uses the natural order of variables. Let $\nu \in \{0,1\}^n$ be the input. The main idea is to remember the bits from $\alpha(\nu)$ and $\beta(\nu)$ which have not been compared yet. Suppose that P_n has already read j bits of $\alpha(\nu)$ and l bits of $\beta(\nu)$ at the $2i$-th level. Each node of the level is associated with the value of string $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_r)$ of bits which are not compared yet. For example, if $j > l$, then $c = (\alpha_{l+1}(\nu), \ldots, \alpha_j(\nu))$; if $j < l$, then $c = (\beta_{j+1}(\nu), \ldots, \beta_l(\nu))$; and, if $j = l$, then c is empty string.

Note that c always contains the bits either from $\alpha(\nu)$ or from $\beta(\nu)$ but never both. If some nodes c contain the bits from $\alpha(\nu)$ and P_n reads such a bit from $\alpha(\nu)$, then it adds this bit to c. Otherwise this bit belongs to $\beta(\nu)$ and P_n compares it with the first bit of c. If both bits are equal, then P_n removes this bit from c and rejects the input otherwise.

[8] K. Ireland and M. Rosen. A Classical Introduction to Modern Number Theory, 2nd ed. *Springer-Verlag*, pages 34–38, 1990.

[9] H. G. Diamond. Elementary methods in the study of the distribution of prime numbers. *Bulletin of The American Mathematical Society*, 7:553–589, 1982.

More formally, let us consider $2i$-th level. It contains four groups of nodes. First of them are the nodes associated with c that contains the bits from $\alpha(\nu)$. The second ones are the nodes for c which contains bits from $\beta(\nu)$. The third one contains only one "equals" node for empty c, and, the fourth one contains only one "rejecting" node.

Let v_c be a node from the first group and $c = (c_1, \ldots, c_r)$ be the string associated with v_c such that c contains the bits from $\alpha(\nu)$. At the $2i$-th level, P_n reads a marker bit ν_{2i+1}. If $\nu_{2i+1} = 0$, that means the next value bit ν_{2i+2} belongs to $\alpha(\nu)$ and then P_n stores bit ν_{2i+2} at the level $2i+1$ and goes to the node corresponding to $c' = (c_1, \ldots, c_r, \nu_{2i+2})$. Otherwise, the next value bit ν_{2i+2} belongs to $\beta(\nu)$ and P_n compares it with c_1. If these bits are the same, then P_n goes to the node corresponding to $c'' = (c_2, \ldots, c_r)$ or to "equals" node if $r = 1$, and goes to "rejecting" node if the bits are different. If c is empty, then P_n goes to the node of the first or the second group associated to $c = (\nu_{2i+2})$ which contains bit from α or from β. If length of c is greater than $k/4$, then P_n goes to "rejecting" node.

For the second group of nodes, P_n works by the same way but the string c stores the bits from $\beta(\nu)$. P_n gives the answer 1 iff it reaches the "equals" node at the last level.

Now we compute the width of P_n. At the $2i$-th level, the first two groups of nodes contain nodes for each value of c both for $\alpha(\nu)$ and for $\beta(\nu)$. The third and forth groups contain "equal" and "rejecting" nodes, respectively. The width of such level is

$$d = (2 + 4 + \cdots + 2^{k/4}) + (2 + 4 + \cdots + 2^{k/4}) + 2 =$$
$$= (2^{k/4+1} - 2) + (2^{k/4+1} - 2) + 2 = 4 \cdot 2^{k/4} - 2.$$

The level $2i+1$ have twice more nodes for the first three groups since P_n needs to remember the value of marker bit, which indicates the next bit belongs to $\alpha(\nu)$ or $\beta(\nu)$. So, the widths of these levels are $8 \cdot 2^{k/4} - 5$ and so the width of P_n is $8 \cdot 2^{k/4} - 5$.

Note that OBDD is particular case of NOBDD and the same result is followed for NOBDDs.

F The Proof of Lemma 7

Let P_n be an OBDD with order $\pi = (j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ that computes $\mathtt{EQS}^{\mathtt{k}}_{\mathtt{n}}$ and l be the number of level such that the l-th level of P_n has already read exactly $k/4$ value bits from $X_K = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$.

Let us consider partition of variables $(\{x_{j_1}, \ldots, x_{j_l}\}, \{x_{j_{l+1}}, \ldots, x_{j_n}\}) = (X_A, X_B)$ and input $\nu = (\sigma, \gamma)$ with respect to this partition. Let set X_V is all value bits from $X_A \cap X_K$ and set $X_M = (X_A \cap X_K) \backslash X_V$ is all marker bits from $X_A \cap X_K$.

Let set $\Sigma = \{\sigma \in \{0,1\}^l$: marker bits for variables from X_M fixed such that value bits for variables from X_V belongs to $\alpha(\nu)$ and other value bit from $X_K \backslash X_V$ belongs to $\beta(\nu)\}$. Note that $|\Sigma| = 2^{k/4}$.

By the same way as in Lemma 3 we can show that each $\sigma \in \Sigma$ reaches different nodes on level l, and therefore the width of l-th level at least $2^{k/4}$.